REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendment and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 7, 12, 15-23, and 25-30 are pending. By the present amendment, Claims 6, 7, 19, 29, and 30 are amended. Support for the present amendment can be found in the originally filed specification, for example, at page 28, line 19 to page 29, line 25, and in corresponding Figure 14. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 6, 7, 12, 15-19, 21-23, 25-27, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Yamamura (U.S. Patent No. 6,981,134); and Claims 20, 28, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamamura in view of Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,727).

Amended Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, an image processing control method including "linking each of the plurality of detailed level converting management units to only a corresponding download setting request-making unit by referring to the information converted from the operating unit for each image processing" and "comparing, by a plurality of the download setting request-making units, each individual parameter to only a corresponding previous setting for the individual parameter set in a linked detailed level converting management unit." Thus, as explained in the originally filed specification, for example, at page 28, line 19 to page 29, line 25, in a case of a filtering process only a download setting request-making unit can refer to information that is set in the detailed level converting management unit of the filter processing. Thus, when there is a change in the specification for an image processing operation, it is easy to specify a location that has to be corrected since the control is divided for each downloaded parameter.

Yamamura describes a system for processing including a control management unit 232 that transmits a generated resource X to the resource acquisition device 236 to perform a

resource acquisition request, wherein the resource acquisition device 236 compares the generated resource X to the past resource group including *all past resources* that device 236 has downloaded.[1] The outstanding Office Action takes the position that the "determining whether each coming process request from the system processor external is consistent with past process requests" described at column 3, lines 43-45 of Yamamura equates to the claimed "comparing . . . each individual parameter to only a corresponding previous setting for the individual parameter."

However, it is respectfully submitted that Yamamura does not disclose or suggest "linking each of the plurality of detailed level converting management units to only a corresponding download setting request-making unit by referring to the information converted from the operating unit for each image processing" or "comparing, by a plurality of the download setting request-making units, each individual parameter to only a corresponding previous setting for the individual parameter set in a linked detailed level converting management unit," as recited in amended Claim 6.

Instead, Yamamura describes that each generated resource X is compared by the resource acquisition device 236 to the past resource group including all past resources of all download requests that resource acquisition device 236 has downloaded. Thus, Yamamura does not describe that the generated resource X is only compared to a subset of the past resource group of corresponding resources linked to a specific resource acquisition device for the generated resource X.

The outstanding Office Action, on pages 13 and 14 states that "Yamamura discloses the claimed subject matter in newly rejected claim 6 wherein the programs and parameters needed to process each 'aspect' of the process request are chosen accordingly and sent to respective memory slot location for execution if the process request is not already present

---

[1] See Yamamura, at column 18, lines 21-30.

from a previous request." However, Applicants again submit that <u>Yamamura</u> merely describes that the programs and parameters needed to process each aspect of the process request are compared against *all previously downloaded resources* located within the past resource group. Thus, the programs and parameters described in <u>Yamamura</u> are not only compared to corresponding programs and parameters previously downloaded located within a linked area of memory.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that <u>Yamamura</u> does not describe or suggest every feature recited in amended Claim 6. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection of Claim 6 as anticipated by <u>Yamamura</u> be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 7, 19, 29, and 30, while directed to alternative embodiments, recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 6. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 6, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 7, 19, 29, and 30 patentably define over <u>Yamamura</u>. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection of Claims 7, 19, 29, and 30, and all claims dependent thereon, as anticipated by <u>Yamamura</u> be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 20, 28, and 29 as unpatentable over <u>Yamamura</u> in view of <u>Yamazaki</u>, it is noted that Claims 20 and 28 are dependent on Claim 19, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Additionally, Claim 29 recites features similar to Claim 19, and thus is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that <u>Yamazaki</u> does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of <u>Yamamura</u>. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 20, 28, and 29 are patentable over <u>Yamamura</u> in view of <u>Yamazaki</u>.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be

outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in

condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Kevin McKinley
Registration No. 43,794